



GREATER VALLEJO RECREATION DISTRICT

Board of Directors
Suzanne Huddleston
R.E. Keith
Liat Meitzenheimer
Michael Palmaffy
Pelton Stewart

395 Amador Street • Vallejo, CA 94590-6320 707 • 648-4600 FAX 707 • 648-4616

RECEIVED
AUG 25 2003

August 21, 2003

SUPERIOR COURT, DEPT. 16
SCOTT KAYS

The Honorable Scott L. Kays, Presiding Judge
Solano County Superior Court
600 Union Avenue
Fairfield, California 94533

Dear Judge Kays:

The Board of Directors of the Greater Vallejo Recreation District is aware of the recommendations of the 2002-2003 Grand Jury as they related to the District. The Board of Directors is taking steps to implement the recommendations applicable to the District as set forth in the Grand Jury's report.

Respectfully submitted,

Greater Vallejo Recreation District

Liat Meitzenheimer, Chairperson

Cc: Jack Morris, Foreperson 2002-2003 Grand Jury
Chester R. Rogaski, Jr.

Mission Statement:

To enhance the leisure and recreational opportunities within our community.

web site: www.gvrd.org



GREATER VALLEJO RECREATION DISTRICT

Board of Directors
Suzanne Huddleston
R.E. Keith
Liat Meitzenheimer
Michael Palmaffy
Pelton Stewart

395 Amador Street • Vallejo, CA 94590-6320 707 • 648-4600 FAX 707 • 648-4616

November 3, 2003

Mr. Louis Burgelin, Foreperson
Solano County Grand Jury
600 Union Avenue
Fairfield, CA 94533

JH # 313

Re: GVRD: Grand Jury Recommendations

Dear Mr. Burgelin:

We have received your letter dated September 19, 2003, which requested that GVRD describe the steps taken to implement the recommendations of the Grand Jury and to respond to three questions submitted to you. Unfortunately, we were unable to comply with your deadline for the response.

At the time of the request to the City of Vallejo for the park dedication fees in 2001-2002, GVRD did not have a written policy which covered requests for the fees and the use thereof. The GVRD Board relied on an unwritten policy wherein the General Manager would apprise the Board of park dedication fee requests and the intended expenditure. In this instance, that unwritten policy was not completely followed by the General Manager. GVRD is in the process of adopting a written policy regarding the use of park dedication fees by adding new section 4.61 to the Policies and Procedures Manual. A copy of the new policy is enclosed.

GVRD did not have a specific written policy addressing the potential conflict in the selection of outside contractors and pursuant to the recommendations of the Grand Jury, we are in the process of drafting the conflict language which would be added to Chapter 4: Fiscal and Financial Procedures of our Policies and Procedures Manual. As soon as the policy is in draft final form, we will provide you with a copy thereof.

GVRD's payment of fees for the ballot measure has two components: one, payment of the fees for the community survey; and, two, payment of fees for the ballot measure. The payment of fees for the community survey was, in our opinion, an appropriate use of park dedication fees pursuant to Vallejo Municipal Code Section 3.18.130 in that the fees were: "... for the benefit or use of parks or recreational facilities ..." The community survey addressed the recreational needs of the District. The initial request for park dedication fees was made of the City of Vallejo on December 19, 2001, and on February 28, 2002, the Board approved the use of the community survey and the cost thereof was paid by monies from park dedication fees. Based upon our extensive research, it appears that the District's General Manager did not submit a specific application to the City for the use of park dedication fees for the payment of costs related to the ballot measure, except for the aforementioned requests for funds for the community survey. Subsequent requests for park dedication fees which were made by

Mission Statement:

To enhance the leisure and recreational opportunities within our community.

web site: www.gvr.org

Mr. Louis Burgelin, Foreperson

November 3, 2003

Page 2

the General Manager were not totally approved by the Board, nor was specific Board action taken to approve the use of the funds for the ballot measure. On two occasions, bills to the ballot measure consulting firm were approved by the Board under the general payment of bills category on the agenda. The Board has addressed this issue through the addition of the aforementioned 4.61 paragraph to the Policies and Procedures, and by adopting a requirement that bills over \$1000 must be segregated in the list of general bills to be paid by the District and approved at the regularly scheduled meetings.

We believe that the above information responds to your requests; however, if additional information is required, please contact us.

Respectfully submitted

GREATER VALLEJO RECREATION DISTRICT

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Liat Meitzenheimer', is written over the printed name.

Liat Meitzenheimer, Chairperson, Board of Directors

LM/vf

Enclosure

Material for October 23, 2003 Board Meeting

10. New Business

- A. Request for Board Approval to Change the Policies and Procedures Manual, Section 2.1j, – Organization, Board of Directors, Committees, and add Section 4.61 – Fiscal and Financial Procedures, Park Dedication Fees Policy.**

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval to change the Policies and Procedures Manual, sections referenced above, to stipulate the procedures for recommending, requesting, and tracking expenditures from Park Dedication Funds.

Background: At the request of the Board of Directors, staff has reviewed our Policies and Procedures in regard to the Capital Outlay Policy for park dedication fees. In this section, park dedication fees are not specifically referenced. How projects would be reviewed/recommended for park dedication funding, who shall make the request for the funds to the City of Vallejo, and how approved project expenses will be tracked once the park dedication funds were acquired need to be addressed. The attached proposed changes to the Policies and Procedures Manual amending committee responsibilities and adding a new section specific to park dedication fees should resolve this oversight. These proposed changes have been reviewed by Legal Counsel.

Attachment: Policies and Procedures, Section 2.1j, and Section 4.61

Cost: None

Committee Reviewed: Budget and Finance Committee, 10/7/2003
Recommended